

☐ UNCLASSIFIED☐ INTERNAL
USE ONLY☐ CONFIDENTIAL☐ SECRET

Approved For Release 2002/10/30 : CIA-RDP86-00101R000100020015-6

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

Legislative Counsel
6D15 HQ

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

20 June 1978

STAT

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S
INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. DDA

7D18 HQ

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

To be sure that all offices concerned with progress of intelligence charter legislation receive copies of all Memoranda for the Record on charter hearings attached are copies of Memoranda for the following hearings which I believe have not yet been disseminated: 3 and 4 May, 15 and 21 June, and 11 July. The only earlier hearing for which we do not have a Memorandum is the 12 May closed hearings; the officer who attended that session will be returning from extended leave shortly. The Memorandum for the 18 July hearing will be available in a couple of days.

We have available copies of the actual transcripts of all hearings available for review in Room 7D35.

Depending on the progress of development of a firm Administration position on the various titles of the charter legislation, we expect to begin discussion with the oversight committees on substance issues very soon.

Chief, Legislation Staff

STAT

OLC 78-0399/91

3 May 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Charter Legislation Hearings

STAT 1. The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence (SSCI) today held the first of two days of hearings on S. 2525, the intelligence charter legislation, concerning relationships between the news media and intelligence agencies. News media witnesses were: Daniel Schorr (columnist and free-lance correspondent), Jack Nelson (Los Angeles Times), and Nicholas Daniloff (United Press International Correspondent). SSCI members present for all or part of the hearing were Senators Birch Bayh and Walter Huddleston. Mr. [] Assistant General Counsel, accompanied the undersigned as an observer.

2. All three of the witnesses endorsed S. 2525 insofar as it attempted to come to grips with the alleged problem of media-intelligence agency relationships. The witnesses concurred in endorsing a statutory prohibition on use of journalists for cover purposes, and Mr. Schorr urged that such a restriction be extended to cover all persons employed by U.S. media organizations. Mr. Schorr, while endorsing the need for legislation to make clear to the U.S. public--as opposed to other countries--that the media is free of manipulation by U.S. intelligence agencies, expressed firm opposition to any law that could be construed to prevent or hinder access to intelligence agencies by the media for "information-gathering purposes." To guard against news media use of information provided by intelligence agencies, Mr. Schorr urged media "self-discipline" rather than legislation. Generally, Mr. Schorr expressed concern that, in restricting relationships between the media and intelligence agencies, the legislation could improperly infringe on the media's First Amendment rights. On the issue of restricting intelligence agencies' access to or "use" of foreign media, Mr. Schorr expressed skepticism that a U.S. law should or could address the matter.

3. Mr. Nelson, as did Mr. Schorr, argued against any legislation that would have the effect of limiting purely voluntary exchanges of information between the media and intelligence agencies; he limited his endorsement of restrictive legislation to the use of the media for cover and to paid relationships. Mr. Daniloff limited his endorsement of "permissible" media-intelligence agency relationships to "public information exchange[s]" and "extraordinary service" (i.e., use of the media as "intermediary ... in times of crisis"). The witnesses attempted to draw a distinction between exchanges of "news" questions--which would be permissible--and "intelligence" questions--which are improper; the distinction did not become clear, however.

4. The matter of Government efforts to have the media refrain from publicizing certain sensitive information--the [] case was mentioned--was addressed. Mr. Nelson said it was up to the Government to prevent disclosures of its secrets and that the media should be free to publish whatever it desired. Mr. Schorr, on the other hand, indicated the question was not so simple, and that such decisions should be addressed on an ad hoc basis rather than by general statutory or regulatory edict.

STAT

5. Senator Huddleston seemed to agree with Mr. Schorr on the point of ad hoc determinations, rather than a law, as to whether the Government should be able to keep the media from publicizing particular sensitive information. Without expressly indicating his views on the matter of a media "code" to "regulate" relationships with intelligence agencies, Senator Huddleston questioned the witnesses on this point. Similarly, the Senator probed the witnesses on the matter of CIA briefings of journalists traveling abroad to look for certain information.

6. Senator Bayh questioned the witnesses on the matter of defining with some precision the range of "permissible" exchanges of information between the media and intelligence agencies. The Senator also expressed an interest, via questions to the witnesses, in the ability of the U.S. to "compete" with "un-free" foreign media if the U.S. Government were prohibited from "using" foreign journalists. Finally, Senator Bayh queried the witnesses on how to resolve the "dilemma" of being able to deal with the news media and the oversight committee's responsibility to keep information secret. In response, Mr. Schorr said the SSCI should provide "retrospective" reports to the public; Mr. Nelson opined that the best the SSCI can do is to release as much information as possible; and Mr. Daniloff said the SSCI had released much--perhaps too much--information already and said he did not know why the Committee should feel under fire to do even more.

STAT

[]
Chief, Legislation Staff
Office of Legislative Counsel

Distribution:

- 2 - O/DCI (Capt. [])
- 1 - DDO/PCS
- 1 - DDS&T
- 1 - DDA
- 1 - NFAC
- 1 - AD-M/NFAC
- 1 - Asst. for Public Affairs
- 1 - []
- 1 - IG
- 1 - Compt
- 1 - OGC
- 1 - OTR/ []
- 1 - OLC Subject
- 1 - OLC Chrono

STAT

STAT

STAT

4 May 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Charter Legislation Hearings

1. The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence held the second of two days of hearings on the news-media and intelligence agencies, in the context of S. 2525, the intelligence charter legislation. News media witnesses were: Mike Wallace (CBS), Philip Geyelin (Washington Post Editorial Page Editor), Richard Leonard (Milwaukee Journal Editor), and Edwin K. Fuller (Associated Press General Manager). The following SSCI members were present for all or part of the hearing: Senators Walter Huddleston, Birch Bayh, Charles Mathias, John Chafee, and William Hathaway.

2. The news media representatives stressed that there are problems of credibility whenever there is public awareness of relationships between intelligence agencies and the news media. There was, however, sharp disagreement--primarily between Mr. Geyelin on the one hand, and the other witnesses on the other hand--as to the extent to which the Government should or could solve this problem by law. Mr. Geyelin made the point strenuously that, in his view, the news media, in supporting statutory restrictions on media-CIA relationships, was improperly asking the Congress to "save it [the media] from itself." Mr. Geyelin also made the point, in opposition to the other witnesses, that S. 2525 should not include restrictions on CIA-media relations simply to "send a message" to the world that U.S. journalists are "untainted" (Mr. Geyelin expressed skepticism that such a "message" would convince the world of anything in the first place). In rebuttal to Mr. Geyelin's endorsement of news media "self-discipline," Mr. Wallace expressed the view that self-discipline was not enough.

3. There also was general agreement among the witnesses that some exchanges of information with the Government are beneficial; in other words, that legislation should not prohibit such contacts altogether. Here again, however, there was no consensus as to the extent to which these exchanges should be "permitted." Mr. Wallace conceded that, so long as exchanges of information between journalists are purely voluntary, such relationships should be permitted. Mr. Fuller said it was more important to have a completely "untainted" press. The witnesses agreed that the law should prohibit the use of the media for cover purposes. On the matter of CIA relationships with foreign journalists, Mr. Leonard expressed the view that the CIA should be prohibited from any such paid relationships.

4. Mr. Wallace and Mr. Leonard opined that whatever restrictions are in the legislation vis-a-vis journalists should extend to other news media persons, such as editors, technicians, etc.

5. Senator Bayh questioned the witnesses on the matter of whether suspicions surrounding media contacts with intelligence agencies could be removed by virtue of a statutory prohibition, and on the question of whether foreign journalists should be "used" to combat misinformation by controlled foreign media. He expressed no specific opinions on these issues.

6. Senator Huddleston was particularly interested in whether the media had any form of "code" governing relationships with intelligence and other Government agencies.

7. Senator Mathias expressed skepticism that the Congress should legislate in this area; the Senator seemed to favor self-discipline by the media. Senator Mathias also wondered whether U.S. journalists are guilty of being "used" by foreign governments and media as some would allege U.S. journalists are being used by U.S. intelligence agencies.

8. Senator Chafee posed the question of why statutory restrictions should apply just to the CIA, when the alleged problem of the media being "tainted" or "used" by the U.S. Government was really a more basic issue with applicability to all Government entities. The Senator also expressed concern with any law that could be construed to prohibit the passage to the Government by the media of a vital piece of information.

9. Senator Hathaway spoke to the matter of singling out the CIA in terms of restricting relationships with the media. The Senator posed the question of whether there should be a law prohibiting relationships between journalists and any non-media entity, including Government agencies and private companies, so as to remove completely any fears that the media is "tainted" and not utterly independent.

Chief, Legislation Staff
Office of Legislative Counsel

STAT

Distribution:

2 - O/DCI (Capt. [redacted])
1 - DDO/PCS
1 - DDS&T
1 - DDA
1 - NFAC
1 - AD-M/NFAC
1 - Asst. for Public Affairs
1 - [redacted]
1 - IG

1 - Compt
1 - OGC
1 - OTR [redacted]
1 - OLC Subject
1 - OLC Chrono

STAT

OLC 78-0399/93

15 June 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Charter Legislation Hearings

1. The Senate Select Committee (SSCI) today received testimony on S. 2525, the intelligence charter legislation, from Gen. (ret.) Richard G. Stilwell and Mr. John S. Warner, representing the Association of Former Intelligence Officers (AFIO), and from Mr. Morton Halperin, representing the Center for National Security Studies. Members of the SSCI present for all or part of the hearing were: Senators Walter Huddleston, Birch Bayh, Barry Goldwater, and Joseph Biden.

2. General Stilwell provided comments on various provisions in each of the titles of S. 2525. In addition, the AFIO representative commented generally on the charter bill, supporting legislation to clarify the charter and guidelines for intelligence agencies and officers, but rejecting S. 2525 as overly detailed, too restrictive, and so ambiguous that it "would require almost as many lawyers as case officers." As to Title I, General Stilwell urged that the proposed Director of National Intelligence (DNI) should not be separated from heading the CIA; that many of the authorities in the bill running to the DNI should more properly run to the CIA as an organization; that intelligence agencies should not have a mandate to conduct counterterrorism activities; that there are far too many reporting requirements in the bill; that the procedures and requirements regarding covert actions are too burdensome and impinge on Presidential prerogatives; and that the charter should continue protection for a secret intelligence budget and for confidential funds authority.

3. The only other title on which General Stilwell offered detailed comments was Title II. The most significant of these comments was a recommendation that the "reasonably believed" standard in the title for collection of certain categories of information, was too high; the AFIO representative recommended that the Committee consider a dual standard--a lower one for collection and a higher standard for the retention or dissemination of intelligence on U.S. persons.

4. Mr. Halperin's comments concerned, among other things, the need to have statutory guidelines for intelligence agencies; that the bill should adhere more closely to the Church Committee recommendations; that the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) is needed now more than ever (in rebuttal to General Stilwell's recommendation that the legislation amend the FOIA to lessen its impact on intelligence agencies);* that covert actions should be undertaken openly as part of American foreign policy; that the analysis functions of CIA should be separated from the collection and operations functions; that there should be a one-line public intelligence budget figure; and that, in certain instances, the U.S. should have the "authority" to seek to influence foreign governments, but only "non-violently" (essentially on a "quid pro quo basis," since other governments certainly attempt to influence or "lobby" the U.S. Government).

5. Senator Bayh questioned General Stilwell as to whether the General was indicting the Committee's security record, since the General had recommended in his remarks that the legislation should address the matter of physical security (of the oversight committees) and secrecy agreements by congressional staffers. General Stilwell said he was commenting generally on the question of congressional security, and in no way meant to impugn the SSCI's security record.

6. Senator Bayh conceded that the Committee probably had been overzealous in including numerous reporting requirements in S. 2525, and that a few "good" reporting provisions probably would be more desirable. On the matter of GAO auditing of intelligence activities and expenditures, Senator Bayh said the relevant provisions in S. 2525 were intended to assist the SSCI so that the Committee would not have to develop its own audit mechanism.

7. Senator Huddleston, in a general statement on S. 2525, stressed that the bill will change, based in part on discussions between the Committee and Executive agencies.

8. In commenting on the matter of the DCI remaining as head of the CIA, Senator Bayh asked General Stilwell why a provision such as in section 117 of Title I would be undesirable, since it only provided a mechanism to separate the two positions if the President so desired. (The Senator did not indicate that the Committee had decided how it would come out on this issue.)

* In this context, Mr. Halperin specifically mentioned an affidavit by Mr. John Blake of 7 June 1978 and a recent exchange of views Mr. Halperin had with the DCI, both on the issue of making public the fact and extent of CIA activities in the academic community.

STAT 9. Senator Goldwater strongly indicated support for retaining the capability and authority to provide support to foreign governments who so request (he noted this in the hypothetical context of a request from the [redacted] Government). In response to Mr. Halperin's remarks expressing the need to ensure that intelligence agencies not maintain improper information on U.S. persons, Senator Goldwater posed the question of whether the concern should run instead to all Federal agencies (not only the CIA) who pry into the affairs of U.S. citizens.

10. Senator Goldwater also expressed support for retaining a covert action capability, and that the only thing to worry about is that the agencies involved not have authority "to initiate or conduct such activities on their own."

[redacted] STAT
Chief, Legislation Staff
Office of Legislative Counsel

Distribution:

STAT 2 - O/DCI (Capt. [redacted])
1 - DDO/PCS
1 - DDS&T
1 - DDA
1 - NFAC
1 - AD-M/NFAC
1 - Asst. for Public Affairs
STAT 1 - [redacted]
1 - IG
1 - Compt
1 - OGC
STAT 1 - OTR/[redacted]
1 - OLC Subject
1 - OLC Chrono

21 June 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: 21 June 1978 Intelligence Charter Hearing

1. On 21 June 1978 the undersigned attended subject hearing at which testimony was received from:

--Thomas I. Emerson, Lines Professor of Law Emeritus,
Yale University, and

--Robert H. Bork, Former Solicitor General, presently
of Yale Law School

2. In his testimony Professor Emerson focused on the activities of the intelligence agencies within the borders of the U.S. and their impact upon the civil liberties of American residents and made the following points in that regard:

--Mr. Emerson identified the First Amendment concern involved in S. 2525 as the issue of where to draw the line between collection of information for legitimate purposes and collection of information which violates constitutional rights.

--Having identified the issue Mr. Emerson stated that where intelligence operations relate to political expression and have a chilling effect, such operations must be confined to searching for data which has a direct and immediate relation to the violation of a criminal statute.

--Additional limitations are imposed upon the intelligence agencies by the Fourth Amendment and by the constitutional right of privacy.

--Mr. Emerson stressed that in his opinion the requirement of issuing of a warrant evidencing a judicial determination of probable cause and "particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized" should not be relaxed or abandoned because the Government is involved in a search for "foreign intelligence"; Mr. Emerson would have this requirement apply to American citizens abroad and to non-resident aliens in the U.S.

--Mr. Emerson concluded, through an examination of constitutional law as interpreted in case law, that the Executive Branch possesses no inherent power to deviate from constitutional requirements because the intelligence agencies are dealing with "foreign intelligence activities."

--Mr. Emerson concluded by saying that S. 2525, like other legislation concerned with national security, must not include provisions which allow the President to disregard constitutional rights or to ignore at will the established law of the land.

3. Mr. Bork in turn emphasized the following matters:

--Mr. Bork began by raising doubts about three aspects of S. 2525 from a legal and policy viewpoint:

- the attempt to control the details of intelligence operations;

- the introduction of judges and a warrant procedure into the conduct of foreign intelligence surveillance, electronic and otherwise; and

- the amount of reporting to groups outside the Intelligence Community.

--With regard to the detailed control of intelligence activities, Mr. Bork stated that this aspect seems to him to be not only unwise but, in all probability, unconstitutional in that it invades Presidential powers under Article II of the Constitution.

--Mr. Bork found many of the provisions of S. 2525 to be overly rigid attempts to safeguard First and Fourth Amendment rights. He stressed that application of the First and Fourth Amendments, like all the great provisions of the Constitutions, depends heavily upon particular circumstances and the weighing of particular facts and the interests involved--flat rules announced in advance are not sufficiently sensitive to these problems.


--Mr. Bork emphasized that while there can be no dispute that constitutional rights must be preserved and no dispute that intelligence agencies must not be allowed to slip out of control, in his opinion there are ways of doing that that are substantially less threatening to constitutional values and to national security than the enactment of complex and detailed legislation.

--Mr. Bork advised that Executive Branch guidelines already developed should be allowed to pass the test of time before legislating detailed controls of dubious constitutionality; in this regard Mr. Bork stressed that such Executive Branch guidelines are fully responsive to First and Fourth Amendment concerns.

--Mr. Bork posed Article II estoppel questions and Article III "case or controversy" questions with regard to the introduction of judges and warrants into the intelligence process.

--Mr. Bork stated that the reporting requirements of S. 2525 seem to spread American intelligence information so broadly as to ensure leaks and diplomatic complications; he recommended a single joint congressional committee so that leaks could be more closely held.




--Mr. Bork concluded by saying that abuses of the past have been cured; the experiences of the past few years and Executive Branch guidelines now in place adequately guard us for the future. Mr. Bork urged that the effectiveness of American intelligence not be hampered further by drafting a complex code that by its nature cannot adequately address the unknowable problems and circumstances of the future.



Assistant Legislative Counsel

STAT

Distribution:

- 2 - O/DCI (Capt. 
- 1 - DDO/PCS
- 1 - DDS&T
- 1 - DDA
- 1 - NFAC
- 1 - AD-M/NFAC
- 1 - Asst. for Public Affairs
- 1 - 
- 1 - IG
- 1 - Compt
- 1 - OGC
- 1 - OTR 
- 1 - OLC Subject
- 1 - OLC Chrono

STAT

STAT

STAT

OLC 78-0399/94

14 July 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: 11 July 1978 Intelligence Charter Hearing

STAT

1. On 11 July 1978, [] OGC, and the undersigned attended another of the continuing open session hearings held by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence (SSCI) on S. 2525, the intelligence charter legislation. The following individuals testified:

- Louis W. Schneider, Executive Secretary, "American Friends Service Committee";
- Ethel Taylor, representing the "Women Strike for Peace"; and
- Richard Gutman, Director and General Counsel, "Chicago Political Surveillance Litigation and Education Project."

Note: A brief description of each of these organizations is provided in an attachment hereto. Each of these organizations was billed as "victims of past intelligence abuses."

2. In terms of Senators present to hear testimony, this session was the most poorly attended. Only Senator Jake Garn (R., Utah) was present. Senator Birch Bayh (D., Ind.) did make an appearance after the witnesses had already made their statements. Consequently, he was unable to meaningfully question the witnesses to elicit further their viewpoints for the record.

3. Mr. Schneider, in his testimony on behalf of the American Friends Service Committee (hereinafter AFSC) made the following points:

- Mr. Schneider stressed that AFSC supports the letter and spirit of the First Amendment with regard to openness and freedom, and is therefore opposed to the continuation of "either secret or overt local, state and federal police activity which undermines and cancels the freedoms which under law they should logically protect";

--Mr. Schneider stated that in April 1976, AFSC issued a statement calling for the abolition of the CIA and the Internal Security Division of the FBI; there was nothing in AFSC's statement and subsequent testimony under questioning to indicate a departure from this stated "solution";

--Quoting from the 1976 AFSC statement mentioned immediately above (a full copy of which is attached), Mr. Schneider underscored the following points:

"The repeated violations of these [CIA and ISD of the FBI] agencies have so unmistakably compromised these two bodies that it is certain that they are beyond salvage as agencies in which Americans can confidently place their trust. Unless strong action is taken, there will always be the fear that they will again, under the cover of secrecy, resort to the kind of improper and illegal methods that have indelibly tarnished their names at home and abroad." (emphasis added)

Mr. Schneider continued:

"Believing in the Quaker ideal of an open society in which we are all free to promote peace, equality and justice without fear, the [AFSC] unhesitatingly adds its voice to those which say that the CIA and [ISD] of the FBI must be abolished." (emphasis added)

--Mr. Schneider stressed that any attempts to reform the intelligence agencies is fraught with "inherent pitfalls" and emphasized the fact that it is AFSC's position that the agencies of the intelligence community are "totally discredited, that their operations have done little if anything to further national security, and that legislative guidelines will be interpreted as to be virtually meaningless";

--Mr. Schneider indicated that, in the opinion of AFSC after review of S. 2525, the proposed charter would "make AFSC and organizations engaged in similar work the legitimate targets of government surveillance";

--Mr. Schneider said that FBI and CIA abuses should not be blamed on particular individuals, but on what he called "the organic and insidious growth of a bureaucratic mentality that has ultimately lost respect for the spirit and letter of the Constitution and is at war with the American people" (emphasis added);

--Mr. Schneider stated that since 1947 the intelligence agencies have taken on a life of their own, expanding in size and scope, and that "despite massive violations of rights and other illegal activities they have accomplished little that would argue for their continued existence";

--Commenting on the proposed charter itself, Mr. Schneider said S. 2525:

--appears to be based on a formula of prohibitions coupled with broad grants of executive discretion which equals the legitimizing of past abuses and the wholesale violation of constitutional rights;

--does not limit the authority to collect information (as may have been intended) but rather empowers the President to expand coverage of "national intelligence activities" thus opening the door to misuse of intelligence gathering capabilities;

--grants authority that goes beyond inquiries into the violation of criminal law or necessities of agency administration;

--contains broad conspiracy language that would continue abuses of the past in that groups could be targets of surveillance because they might in the future develop into a group capable of engaging in a criminal violation;

--contains guidelines regarding actions that the intelligence agencies may engage in that are remarkably vague and consists of grants of power that would allow the COINTELPRO to operate domestically and permit such activities as the overthrow of a Chilean government.

--Mr. Schneider concluded by conceding that "[r]ealism compels us to recognize that the AFSC remedy for intelligence agency abuse is a goal that may not be fully reached."

4. Ms. Taylor, representing the "Women Strike for Peace" made the following points:

--the charter should tighten prohibitions rather than create loopholes which legitimize violations;

--the bill as drafted appears to officially sanction abuses which the bill is supposed to eliminate;

--the bill makes no provision for expungement of records of groups or individuals under surveillance;

--Ms. Taylor objected to the "reasonable belief" standard, citing section 213 of S. 2525, as a vaguer standard for authorizing an investigation than the standard set up in the Fourth Amendment which requires "probable cause to believe" that a person has committed or is about to commit a crime;

--there is no reason for surveillance of Americans abroad unless it is for criminal investigations and under the direction of the Justice Department;

--S. 2525 is so broadly written and in such vague general language that it readily lends itself to "national security" interpretation so as to permit an intelligence entity to conduct almost any kind of activity it wishes; little comfort can be found in the statute's reliance on the Attorney General or his designees;

--Ms. Taylor concluded by saying that "Women Strike for Peace" is not suggesting that there be no intelligence activity in the U.S., but rather that such activity must come under constitutional control; in the opinion of "Women Strike for Peace," S. 2525 needs major revision to attain this goal.

5. Mr. Gutman, with particular reference to the abuses of the CIA as relate to the class action lawsuit he is involved in as plaintiff's counsel, made the following comments and recommendations:

--Domestic counterintelligence activities should not occur unless there is a reasonable suspicion, based on concrete evidence of a violation of the criminal statutes, including criminal espionage, criminal treason or criminal sabotage;

--The CIA could easily use section 221 of S. 2525 (background investigations) as a pretext to engage in domestic spying on an American citizen; the CIA should not engage in a background investigation of a potential recruit without first acquiring the individual's permission, which consent could easily be acquired without disclosing the details of the proposed operation;

--A provision should expressly provide for the destruction of all information currently in the CIA files without foreign intelligence value;

--Mr. Gutman concluded by stating that rather than prohibit the types of abuses made evident in his lawsuit, S. 2525 would legitimize them; he called for a major rewrite of S. 2525 to "ensure that the CIA's systematic abuses of human rights not reoccur" and stated that "S. 2525's failure to require that CIA operations be subject to the same standards as the future security of the American people."

6. Questioning by Senator Garn took the form of the Senator expressing astonishment over what he considered an "overindictment" of the intelligence agencies by the witnesses. While strongly supporting the CIA and its employees and emphasizing the massive attempts by the Soviet Union at espionage within the U.S., Senator Garn said he found it incredible that anyone would recommend abolishing the CIA, thus leaving all U.S. citizens subject to KGB activities. Senator Garn accused the witnesses of the same form of extremism that resulted in the abuses of the past (e.g., by their broad condemnation of the entire intelligence community Senator Garn said the witnesses have condemned intelligence on the basis of "guilt by association.") Senator Garn stressed that the vast majority of CIA and FBI officials welcome guidelines, which, he said, might come as a surprise to the witnesses. In closing Senator Garn said that the sum total of the witnesses' testimony goes beyond permissiveness and would serve only to undermine legitimate intelligence activities.

7. Senator Bayh, during the questioning process, made the following points:

--Since the Ford Administration with Mr. Levi as Attorney General and continuing with the Carter-Bell team, intelligence agencies are operating in a different environment;

--While we must learn from the past, any effort at reform must strike a delicate balance which is a very difficult thing to do in the legislative process;

--Senator Bayh said that he senses a movement away from the need for charter legislation; he said he feels pressure to allow business to transpire as usual*; Senator Bayh said he would not accept this.

--Following up on his previous comment, Senator Bayh said that he is concerned that there is a movement afoot in the context of charter legislation that espouses the idea that the alternative to prudent legislation should be no legislation.

--In response to a question by one of the witnesses who asked if the Committee as a whole reflects Senator Garn's fear of a massive Soviet network in this country to the point that such fear would have a chilling effect on this legislation, Senator Bayh responded that there is a threat which must be dealt with firmly but without damage to the rights of U.S. citizens. Senator Bayh concluded by adding that foreign governments are doing things that we have not been able to find out how to constitutionally stop (Mr. Bayh did not elaborate).

Assistant Legislative Counsel

STAT

*Note: Senator Bayh had spent the morning of 11/11/85 with other congressional leaders summoned by the President to discuss intelligence matters.

Distribution:

STAT

- 2 - O/DCI (Capt.)
- 1 - DDO/PCS
- 1 - DDS&T
- 1 - DDA
- 1 - NFAC
- 1 - AD-M/NFAC
- 1 - Asst. for Public Affairs

STAT

- 1 -
- 1 - IG

STAT

- 1 - Compt
- 1 - OGC
- 1 - OTRM
- 1 - OLC Subject
- 1 - OLC Chrono

WOMEN STRIKE FOR PEACE

Founded 1961

National Coordinator: Ethel Taylor

Headquarters: 145 South 13th Street, Philadelphia

Staff: 1

Publications: The Story of Disarmament,
The German Problem and other material

Description of Purpose and Activities:

"Women of all races, creeds and political persuasions who are dedicated to the achievement of general and complete disarmament under effective international control." Promotes "discussion in local communities by walks, vigils, forums, panels, by emblems, seals, car stickers, umbrellas, by letter-writing campaigns..." Supports "peace candidates," sponsors political debate.

AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE

Founded 1917

Executive Secretary: Louis W. Schneider

Headquarters: 1501 Cherry Street, Philadelphia

Staff: 500 (10 regional groups)

Publications: Quaker Service Bulletin 3/year
Annual Report

Description of Purpose and Activities:

Attempts to relieve human suffering and to find new approaches to world peace and nonviolent social change. Works in 17 countries in refugee rehabilitation, peace education and community development. Seeks to build informed public resistance to militarism and the military-industrial complex. Prepares literature audiovisual materials on current world problems. Sponsors off-the-record seminars and meetings. Programs are interracial, interdenominational, and international.

Co-recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize

CHICAGO POLITICAL SURVEILLANCE LITIGATION
AND EDUCATION PROJECT

Founded January 1975

Director and General Counsel: Richard Gutman

Headquarters: 407 South Dearborn Street, Rm 505, Chicago

Staff: 2

Description of Purpose and Activities:

The Chicago Political Surveillance Litigation and Education Project, an arm of the Alliance to End Repression, is responsible for litigating the federal class-action lawsuit Alliance to End Repression et. al. vs. James Rochford, et. al. 407 F. Supp. 115, 75 F.R.D. 428 et seq. and for educating the public regarding the issues raised by that litigation.

STATEMENT ON THE CIA AND FBI

The scandalous and unlawful activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and the Internal Security Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation have shocked Americans to the point that serious and responsible voices are calling for them to be abolished.

The repeated violations of these agencies have so unmistakably compromised these two bodies that it is certain that they are beyond salvage as agencies in which Americans can confidently place their trust. Unless strong action is taken, there will always be the fear that they will again, under the cover of secrecy, resort to the kind of improper and illegal methods that have indelibly tarnished their names at home and abroad.

Believing in the Quaker ideal of an open society in which all are free to promote peace, equality and justice without fear, the American Friends Service Committee unhesitatingly adds its voice to those which say that the CIA and the Internal Security Division of the FBI must be abolished.

The elimination of the CIA and the Internal Security Division of the FBI will serve as an unmistakable warning to any successor agencies. But even so clear a warning is not enough. The practices which brought these two bodies into disrepute must be unequivocally ended, for the same methods committed by any successor agencies would be as intolerable as if they were undertaken by the CIA or FBI.

We reject and call on all others to reject clandestine U.S. activities abroad such as subverting governments by bribery and corruption, secret military action, assassinations and conspiracy.

At home we reject and call on all others to reject illegal wiretapping, mail interception, burglaries, cover-ups, surveillance and infiltration of lawful groups, use of agents provocateurs, investigations of dissent and dissenters used by the party in power against its opponents or critics, and the maintenance of political dossiers on citizens and groups exercising legitimate rights.

We urge that such practices by the CIA, the Internal Security Division of the FBI, and by the numerous other federal, civil and military intelligence agencies be outlawed and that all government attempts to preserve these functions in any form or under any agencies be prevented.

We recognize that, sometimes in league with federal agencies and sometimes independently, state and local police forces are engaged in some of these practices. They, too, must be stopped. The development and use of computerized information systems must not provide tools to a

secretive and autocratic police. We urge the Congress to investigate rigorously the dissemination of information gathered under such systems and to enact strict detailed guidelines to prevent abuse of data systems.

We urge our government to end the practice of classifying information in its possession as a device to hide its own agents' mistakes or violations of law. We call for a system of accountability which will require all public officials to refrain from lying and deception of the American public.

We insist that those in government service who detect such transgressions and make them public shall be protected -- indeed honored -- rather than harassed or treated as criminals.

As for foreign intelligence activities, we do not believe that there should be one standard for American citizens and another standard for others justifying American government actions abroad which we would not tolerate at home. To those who say we must fight fire with fire by engaging in reprehensible actions at home and abroad, because others will commit such actions against us, we reply that we are not ready passively to give up our ideals ourselves out of fear of what others may do.

In this imperfect world the U.S. government will undoubtedly continue to gather foreign intelligence. Congress must fulfill its constitutional obligation to oversee this activity by prohibiting the kinds of acts which have brought the intelligence community into disrepute and by providing sanctions against those who overstep the bounds of law and decency.

Approved by the AFSC Board of Directors, April 24, 1976